REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-12 and 15-20 have been amended. Original claims 1-20 remain pending in the application.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claim 1, 2, 5-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. patent no. 6,810,405 to LaRue at al.

In response to this rejection, applicant traverses as follows:

Claim 1, as amended, recites a method of database synchronization between a first database on a server and a second corresponding database on a wireless computing device, comprising the steps of:

generating on a wireless computing device a synchronization request message, wherein *the synchronization request message includes a data object, and an action executed on the data object*;

transmitting the synchronization request message from the wireless computing device to a server;

validating the data object and the action on the server *based upon the synchronization request message and business logic, defined by a user of the wireless computing device, corresponding to a domain of the data object*;

updating a remote data storage on the server based upon the business logic;

generating a *synchronization response message* on the server based on results corresponding to the validating and the updating steps;

transmitting the *synchronization response message* from the server to the wireless computing device; and

updating a data storage on the wireless computing device based upon the synchronization response message.

48

The database synchronization method which is disclosed by LaRue et al comprises the steps of:

the sync client sends an Action Retrieve Records object to the sync engine, *the Action Retrieve Records object is a request from the sync client for the sync engine to send changes to the sync client*, and the sync engine receives the Action Retrieve Records object *after* it has completed conflict and duplicate resolution of the changes received (see col. 17, lines 49-67 and col. 18, lines 1-2); and

the sync client sends an Action Request Ack Records object to the sync server, the sync engine receives the Action Request Ack Records object, and sends an *Action Ack Records object, listing record IDs from the sync client for each change received* (see col. 20, line 15-23).

Specially, claim 1 recites that the synchronization request message includes a data object, and an action executed on the data object; whereas LaRue et al discloses that the Action Retrieve Records object is only a request from the sync client for the sync engine to send changes to the sync client. These aspects of the respective methods are plainly different from each other.

In addition, in claim 1, the data object and the action are validated on the server based upon the synchronization request message and business logic, defined by a user of the wireless computing device, corresponding to a domain of the data object. In contrast, conflict and duplicate resolutions of LaRue et al are not based on the Action Retrieve Records object. The sync engine receives the Action Retrieve Records object after the sync engine has completed conflict and duplicate resolutions of the changes received.

Moreover, the Action Ack Records object is for listing record IDs from the sync client for each change received, whereas the synchronization response message in claim 1 is generated based on results corresponding to the validating and the updating steps. These aspects of the respective methods are plainly different from each other.

49

Accordingly, applicant submits that claim 1 is different from and novel over LaRue et al. Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 1 be removed, and that the claim be allowed.

Claims 2 and 5-7 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, and incorporate more features therein respectively. Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 2 and 5-7 are also novel over the cited reference and in a condition for allowance.

Claim 8 recites a method of verifying an action taken on a data object stored on a local data storage of a wireless computing device, comprising the steps of:

generating a synchronization request message on a wireless computing device, wherein the synchronization request message includes a copy of a data object on a local data storage, an action that has been taken on the data object, and *an old data object corresponding to the data object prior to when the action was taken*;

transmitting the *synchronization request message* from the wireless computing device to a server; and

processing the copy of the data object on a remote data storage on the server based upon *business logic corresponding to a domain of the data object and defined by a user of the wireless computing device.*

The LaRue et al reference discloses a procedure of sending "fresh" changes to the sync server in the form of action objects, wherein *each of these action objects will include, in addition to any new data values, the record ID of the sync client for the specific record to be acted upon and a timestamp indicating the time at which the change was originally entered into a device.* However, there is no disclosure that the action objects include any old data values. In contrast, the synchronization request message in claim 8 further includes an old data object corresponding to the data object prior to when the action was taken, and is thus plainly different from the action objects of LaRue et al.

50

In addition, the Action Retrieve Records object in LaRue et al is only a request from the sync client for the sync engine to send changes to the sync client (see col. 17, lines 52-54); whereas the synchronization request message in claim 8 includes a copy of a data object on a local data storage, an action that has been taken on the data object, and an old data object corresponding to the data object prior to when the action was taken. The Action Retrieve Records object and the synchronization request message are different from each other in content.

Moreover, claim 8 discloses a procedure of processing the copy of the data object on a remote data storage on the server based upon business logic and the synchronization request message. However, LaRue et al performs conflict resolution and duplicate resolution according to the fresh change in the form of action objects from the sync client. The fresh change does not include the old data object (i.e., the fresh change is different from the synchronization request message). Consequently, the method for performing conflict resolution and duplicate resolution is different from the procedure of processing the copy of the data object in claim 8.

Accordingly, applicant submits that claim 8 is different from and novel over Larue et al. Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 8 be removed, and that the claim be allowed.

Claims 9-14 depend directly or indirectly from claim 8, and incorporate more features therein respectively. Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 9-14 are also novel over the cited reference and in a condition for allowance.

Claim 15 is an independent method claim paralleling the features of independent method claim 8, and claims 16-20 depend directly or indirectly from claim 15. According to the assertions made above regarding claim 8, applicant submits that claims 15-20 should also be allowable.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

A. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LaRue et al in view of Hertzog et al.

Applicant respectfully traverses and submits that the pending claim is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over LaRue et al in view of Hertzog et al.

Hertzog et al. does not disclose or suggest any specifics regarding the distinguishing feature of the *synchronization request message* in claim 3. In Hertzog et al, the synchronization engine may implement a "message queue" functionality whereby pending messages held by the application server are retrieved for processing and display by the client application, and a "recruiting" functionality (see page 5, paragraph [0057]), wherein *the messages refer to notifications of other user's subscriptions or updates etc* (see page 4, paragraph [0054]). In contrast, in claim 3 *the synchronization request message includes a data object, and an action executed on the data object.* In addition, because claim 3 depends from independent claim 1 which is asserted to be allowable over LaRue et al (see above), it is submitted that claim 3 is allowable over LaRue et al in view of Hertzog et al.

B. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LaRue et al in view of Oulid-Aissa et al.

Applicant respectfully traverses and submits that the pending claim is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over LaRue et al in view of Oulid-Aissa et al.

Oulid-Aissa et al does not disclose or suggest any specifics regarding the distinguishing feature of the synchronization response message in claim 4. In fact, the results passed to the user in Oulid-Aissa et al. include the appropriate instances of the needed object classes retrieved, whereas the synchronization response message in claim 4 includes a value corresponding to the validating and updating

step. These entities of the respective inventions are different and should not be construed as being equivalent.

In addition, because claim 4 depends from independent claim 1 which is asserted to be allowable over LaRue et al (see above), it is submitted that claim 4 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over LaRue et al in view of Oulid-Aissa et al.

In view of the above claim amendments and remarks, the subject application is believed to be in a condition for allowance, and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Shi et al.

By _____
    Wei Te Chung

Registration No.: 43,325
Foxconn International, Inc.
P.O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive, Santa
                 Clara, CA 95050
Tel. No.: (408) 919-6137

53